IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.R.RAMAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

FRIDAY, THE 17TH AUGUST 2007 / 26TH SRAVANA 1929

RP.No. 627 of 2007()

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WA.228/2007 Dated 26/03/2007
.....

REVIEW PETITIONER/1ST RESPONDENT

THE CORPORATE MANAGER OF ALL C.S.I.
SCHOOLS IN MALABAR & WAYANAD BANK ROAD,
CALICUT.

BY ADV. SRI.N.N.SUGUNAPALAN (SR.)
SRI.S.SUJIN

RESPONDENTS: APPELLANT & RESPONDENTS 2 & 3 IN THE WPC
---

1. VALSALA,
SANSKRIT TEACHER, B.E.M. U.P.SCHOOL, PARAPPERI,
P.O.THRIPRANCODE, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

2. THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTIONS,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. G.PADMAKUMARI AMMA,
SANSKRIT TEACHER, B.E.M. U.P.SCHOOL, THRIKIDEERI,
OTTAPPALAM, PALAKKAD DISTRICT.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.V.RAJENDRAN
R2 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI SANDESH RAJA
R3 BY ADV.SRI.GEORGE ABRAHAM

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 17/08/2007 ALONG WITH R.P.NO.628/2007,THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

P.R.RAMAN & ANTONY DOMINIC, JJ.

R.P.NO.627 OF 2007 IN
W.A.NO.228 OF 2007 &
R.P.NO.628 OF 2007 IN
W.A.NO.518 OF 2007

Dated this the 17th day of August,2007

O R D E R

Antony Dominic,J.

The main ground on which the petitioner seeks review of the judgment is that the posting of the case was not noticed by the Clerk. It is also stated that there were complaints against the lst respondent in R.P.No.627/07, who is also the 2nd respondent in R.P.NO.628/07 and that the said aspect could be brought to the notice of the court, when the appeals were heard. On going through the records, we notice that despite service of notice on the review petitioner both in the writ petitions and in the appeals, the review petitioner did not appear in court. Thus, the review petitioner having not entered appearance through counsel, there is no merit in the statement that the Clerk failed to make note of the postings.

2. However, we heard the learned counsel on merits also and we are satisfied that the judgment is not vitiated on the grounds urged by the review petitioner. As regards the alleged complaint mentioned by the review petitioner, we feel that this is not a matter to be considered

in a petition for review. We do not find any merits in these review petitions.

Review Petitions stand dismissed.

P.R.RAMAN,
Judge.

ANTONY DOMINIC,
Judge.

kcv.